

PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION: NASA/NFESC COMMENTS BY: Richard Zuromski, SWDIV	DATE: October 5, 2001 TYPE OF REVIEW: Groundwater Monitoring Report – Draft (SOTA, July 2001)
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

DESIGN COORDINATION AND REVIEW – COMMENTS SOUTHWESTNAVFACENGCOM 11012/1A (8-93)			PROJECT LEADER:
COMMENTS BY: Richard Zuromski	CODE:	PHONE:	DATE: 07/13/01
PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION: JPL Site – Pasadena, California REVIEW DUE:			TYPE OF REVIEW:
Note: Page numbers referenced correspond to the page numbers in the Adobe Acrobat (.pdf) file, actual document page numbers follow in parentheses.			
NO.	REFERENCE	REVIEW COMMENT	A-E RESPONSE
1.	Page 11 (1) 1 st paragraph 1 st sentence	Should read “part of the groundwater monitoring program.... under contract with (remove comma) the Naval Facilities Engineering Command.	Text revised as noted.
2.	Page 12 (2)	Can’t read last line on the bottom of page 12.	Printing error corrected on final document.
3.		We should also reevaluate the purging method for the shallow wells .	<p>We agree that low-flow sampling procedures (as described in EPA's Technical Document EPA/540/S-95/504) would minimize the volume of groundwater purged and may be suitable for implementation at JPL. However, the EPA document indicates that there are some disadvantages to low-flow purging, including greater set-up time in the field and concern that new data will indicate a change in conditions and trigger an action.</p> <p>Regardless of the advantages and disadvantages of low-flow purging, the Navy should obtain concurrence from the applicable regulatory agencies prior to implementing such a change in the field sampling plan for JPL.</p>
4	Page 15 (6)	Can’t read last line on bottom of page.	Printing error corrected on final document.

PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION: NASA/NFESC COMMENTS BY: Richard Zuromski, SWDIV	DATE: October 5, 2001 TYPE OF REVIEW: Groundwater Monitoring Report – Draft (SOTA, July 2001)
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

5	Page 17 (7) Section 3	I think we say that well #2 was replaced by well #14 three times in this report. Is it really necessary to repeat this again? Same comment regarding MW-7.	Text revised so only stated once (pg. 1, ¶ 4)
6	Page 17 (6) 3 rd paragraph 1 st sentence	Change to “Nine chemicals have been....”	Text revised as noted.
7		Good job on using City of Pasadena and Lincoln Avenue data in contours	Thanks
8	Page 22 (11) 1 st bullet:	Change to “The chemical plumes beneath JPL...”	Text revised as noted.
9		Other conclusions regarding anomalous results?	No significant “anomalous results” reported.